

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Status of the Claims**

This application was originally filed with claims 1-31. Those claims were grouped by the Examiner as falling in two groups comprising claims 1-16 and 17-31. The Applicant elected to pursue claims 1-16. Claims 17-31 were cancelled without prejudice and a new set of claims 32-43 was added. The Examiner objected to the new set of claims asserting that they with did not form a single inventive concept with claims 1-16 due to the "business customer" limitations found in claim 32.

The Applicant has decided, with the filing of a RCE, amend claim 1 to bring it into closer alignment with claim 32 by adding the essence of the "business customer" limitations from claim 32. Claims 2-31 are cancelled without prejudice. Since the Examiner used the business customer difference between claims 1 and 32 to justify withdrawing claims 32-43 from examination, that basis difference has now been removed by this amendment of claim 1 and therefore the basis for asserting that the claims 32-43 were patentably distinct from claim 1 has been overcome. Therefore the Examiner is respectfully requested to rejoin claims 32-43 (subject to the comments below) with claim 1 as amended for examination purposes.

With respect to claims 32-43 please note the following comments:

(i) claims 33-34 have been cancelled without prejudice.

(ii) linking claims tying the claims 17-31 to the set of claims 1, 32, & 35-43 have been added to this set of claims: New claims 44-47, dependent on claim 32, are otherwise very similar to original claims 17-20 and new claims 48 and 49, also dependent on claim 32, are otherwise very similar to original claims 21 and 23. So it is believed that claims corresponding to original claims 17-31 should also be examined giving this linking. Since claims 17-31 were cancelled without

prejudice, they are being re-introduced as new claims 50-62 (with some minor amendments being made to address editorial errors and with a few of the the original set of claims, namely claims 26, 28 and 29, not being carried over to the new set).

Given this linking and the present similarity between independent claims 1 and 32, it is respectfully submitted that it would be appropriate for the Examiner to examine all of the claims presently pending in this application at the same time.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Office with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

\_\_\_\_\_  
July 27, 2007  
(Date of Deposit)

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Berg  
(Name of Person Depositing)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
July 27, 2007  
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Richard P. Berg  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Reg. No. 28,145  
LADAS & PARRY  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard,  
Suite 2100  
Los Angeles, California 90036  
(323) 934-2300 voice  
(323) 934-0202 facsimile